UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,158	01/04/2005	Holger Klapproth	JST-02U1	9557
	7590	EXAMINER		
625 BROADWAY Suite 1210 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101			AUDET, MAURY A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1654	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	view Summary 10/520,158 KLAPPROTH, HOLGER	KLAPPROTH, HOLGER
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	MAURY AUDET	1654
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>MAURY AUDET, Examiner</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Raymond Wagenknecht, Applicant's</u> <u>Representative</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 4 June 2009	Time: <u>1600</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: NA		
Claims discussed: NA		
Prior art documents discussed: NA		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	3 DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	he examiner will provide a writt record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Maury Audet/ Examiner, Art Unit 1654	(Applicant/Applicant's Representa	tive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: A printer rush post-allowance was sent to the Examiner indicating that specification amendment (replacement paragraph) #3 in the response of 7/18/05 did not make sense in the context of that paragraph and was an exact copy of the paragraph inserted under #4. All such amendments to #'s 1-2 & 4 appear to be grammatical in nature. Applicant has deemed the amendment noted as #3 to be an inadvertent mistake and approved of the Examiners Amendment to correct the paragraph back to it's original, which did not have any noticeable errors. Should such be found later, Applicant indicated a Certificate of Correction will be filed.